



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,411	08/15/2003	Bruce Downing	04006.00011	1474

7590 08/30/2004

Steven Thrasher
391 Sandhill Dr.
Richardson, TX 75080

EXAMINER

UNDERWOOD, DONALD W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3652

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/642,411

Applicant(s)

DOWNING, BRUCE

ST

Examiner

Donald Underwood

Art Unit

3652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08/15/03.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08/15/03 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

1. The drawing is objected to under 37CFR 1.83(a) as failing to show and label skids (claim 1), a channel (claim 2), a channel in the lower portion of the front of the bucket (claim 3), loops (claim 10), and braces (claim 13). Correction is required. The introduction of new matter should be guarded against.

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

It is unclear how the channel is disposed in a lower portion of the front of the bucket.

It is unclear how the braces are constructed.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 8, "the cut of the conical section" lacks a clear antecedent basis rendering the claim indefinite.

Art Unit: 3652

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1, 5, 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Pettersson.

Note the front lip of Pettersson's bucket broadly comprises a pourer portion.

8. Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Gesuale.

Note the front lip of Gesuale's bucket broadly comprises a pourer portion.

Regarding claim 7, note 26 in figure 4 of Gesuale.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, the sections in beams 12 comprising openings 16 (figure 2 in Gesuale) are synonymous with the claimed loops.

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-4 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deye in view of Pettersson or Gesuale.

Note 10 in Deye is synonymous with the claimed bucket and 60 is synonymous with the power portion, or the back, bottom and sides of 10 are synonymous with the claimed bucket and the front wall and 60 are synonymous with the power portion.

Art Unit: 3652

It would have been obvious to provide skid receivers on the container in Deye for use with skids in view of the teaching in Pettersson or Gesuale.

11. Claims 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deye in view of Pettersson or Gesuale as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Slagter.

It would have been obvious to substitute a spout structure for the bucket front and 60 in Deye in view of the teaching in Slagter. Whether this spout was as shown in Slagter or some other conventional spout such as a cone or triangular arrangement would have been obvious to an artisan.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to D. Underwood at telephone number 703-308-1113.

Underwood/vs
August 20, 2004

Donald W. Underwood 08/25/04
DONALD W. UNDERWOOD
PRIMARY EXAMINER